

### INTERVIEW SUMMARY

1. Ms Perez, Applicant's representative, called and requested an interview before replying to the pending office action. Examiner granted a provisional interview for 2/21/2010 pending receipt of proposed claims. On 2/18/2010, Ms. Perez faxed proposed claims. On 2/19/2010, Examiner called Ms. Perez and explained that the claims have significant 112(2) problems, including the recitation "substrate comprises: haze of not more than ... ." Examiner also explained that 112(1) support must be provided for the effective area being at least 2 squared inches. And Examiner noted that new claims that are distinct from the already examined claims will be restricted if prosecuting them will cause serious burden.

During the 2/24/2010 interview, Ms. Perez again explained that the prior art did not show haze over at least two inches being less than 1 ppm. In response, Examiner explained that there is no support for the effective area being at least two inches. Rather, Examiner explained that haze testing (as any reflection testing) would not be done over a large area at once, rather the illumination beam is focused onto a smaller area, and the total area of the surface is scanned by moving the illumination beam, which Ms. Perez confirmed.

Ms. Perez also explained that Applicant contended that proposed claim 1 distinguished over the applied art because the applied prior art did not disclose being free from an oxidization film, which allegedly detrimentally affects haze. In response, Examiner explained that proposed claim 1 is not free from such a surface either and that it recites comprising, which in effect makes the claim scope include such a surface. Examiner also wondered that if some, as yet, undisclosed etching is performed by Applicant to insure the surface is free from oxidization film, then, in addition to 112(1) issues with such a claim/argument, why would one of ordinary skill in the art not have applied such an etch. And Examiner again noted that a reply including claims distinct from those already examined and causing serious burden on examination would be withdrawn from consideration in this application.

### **CONCLUSION**

2. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from an Examiner should be directed to Examiner Hrayr A. Sayadian, at (571) 272-7779, on Monday through Friday, 7:30 am – 4:00 pm ET.

If attempts to reach Mr. Sayadian by telephone are unsuccessful, his supervisor, Supervisory Primary Examiner Wael Fahmy, can be reached at (571) 272-1705. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available only through Private PAIR.

For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. The Electronic Business Center (EBC) at (866) 217-9197 (toll-free) may answer questions on how to access the Private PAIR system.

/Hrayr A. Sayadian/

Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2814